Appeal: 14-6417 Doc: 14 Filed: 08/20/2014 Pg: 1 of 4

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6417

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WILKINS MCNAIR, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 14-6426

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WILKINS MCNAIR, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, District Judge. (1:06-cr-00281-CCB-1; 1:11-cv-01902-CCB; 1:09-cr-00320-CCB-1; 1:12-cv-03546-CCB)

Submitted: July 30, 2014 Decided: August 20, 2014

Before SHEDD, AGEE, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Appeal: 14-6417 Doc: 14 Filed: 08/20/2014 Pg: 2 of 4

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Wilkins McNair, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Jefferson McClure Gray, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Wilkins McNair, Jr. seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motions. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that McNair has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability in No. 14-6417, deny McNair's motion for a certificate of appealability in No. 14-6426, and dismiss the appeals. We dispense with oral argument

Appeal: 14-6417 Doc: 14 Filed: 08/20/2014 Pg: 4 of 4

because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED